

REMARKS

Applicants appreciate the Examiner's thorough consideration provided the present application. Claims 1, 2, 4-8, 10 and 12-18 are now present in the application. Claims 1, 4, 8 and 10 have been amended. Claims 1 and 8 are independent. Reconsideration of this application, as amended, is respectfully requested.

Interview With The Examiner

An interview was conducted with the Examiner in charge of the above-identified application on February 13, 2008. Applicants greatly appreciate the courtesy shown by the Examiner during the interview.

In the interview with the Examiner, Applicants' representative explained the system to the Examiner and the features of the switching between two data paths where one bypasses the controller and the other connects the memory card to the host through the controller. The Examiner stated that the claims could be made allowable by providing a better description of the two data paths.

In addition, Applicants' representative has also proposed to amend claims 1 and 8 to address the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph during the interview.

In the Amendment, claims 1 and 8 have been amended to recite the two data paths and to address the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph based on the discussion during the interview, as described hereinbelow.

Reasons For Entry Of Amendments

Applicants submit that this Amendment was not presented at an earlier date in view of the fact that Applicants are responding to a new ground of rejection set forth in the Final Office Action. In accordance with the requirements of 37 C.F.R. §1.116, Applicants respectfully request entry and consideration of the foregoing amendments.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §112

Claims 1 and 8 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants regard as the invention. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

In view of the foregoing amendments, it is respectfully submitted that this rejection has been addressed. Reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection are respectfully requested. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, are therefore respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1, 2, 4-8, 10 and 12-18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being anticipated by Mambakkam, U.S. Patent Application Publication No. US 2003/0093606. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

In light of the foregoing amendments to the claims, Applicants respectfully submit that this rejection has been obviated and/or rendered moot. As the Examiner will note, independent claims 1 and 8 have been amended to recite “the first data bus connects the memory card directly

to the host system and the second data bus connects the memory card to the host system and the IO card through the IO controller.” Applicants respectfully submit that the above recitation as set forth in amended independent claims 1 and 8 is not disclosed nor suggested by the reference relied on by the Examiner.

In the claimed invention, the first data bus connects the memory card directly to the host system and the second data bus connects the memory card to the host system and the IO card through the IO controller. In other words, there two data paths where one bypasses the controller and the other connects the memory card to the host through the controller. Mambakkam does not include such a bypass data bus that directly connects the memory card and the host. Therefore, Mambakkam fails to teach “*the first data bus connects the memory card directly to the host system* and the second data bus connects the memory card to the host system and the IO card through the IO controller” as recited in claims 1 and 8.

Applicants also respectfully submit that the present invention transmits data either directly from the memory card to the host system, or from the memory card to the IO card controller 412, then to the host system. The I/O card of the present invention is not only an adapter between the add-on memory card and the host, but also serves as an individual data communication device. When the I/O card is used as an adapter for add-on memory, the I/O card provides data path between memory card and host as well as between memory card and I/O device. The I/O device here is a device to be connected to the I/O card for input/output signals to the host, such as camera, scanner, WiFi or Bluetooth.

Unlike the present invention, in Mambakkam, there is only one memory card to be used to transmit data to the host via a specific adapter. The adapter controller IC of the specific

adapter of the utilized reference provides the functions of data transmission and verification between the host and the memory card (flash storage). This is different from the functions of the I/O card of the present invention. Unlike Mambakkam, the I/O card of the present invention can be connected to an I/O device, such as camera, scanner, WiFi or Bluetooth, to transmit data to host. In addition, when an add-on memory card 304 is inserted into the I/O card 302, data transmitting path of the I/O card share with the memory card to improve the data transmission efficiency. Those features are clearly absent from the utilized reference.

Since Mambakkam fails to teach each and every limitation of independent claims 1 and 8, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1 and 8 and their dependent claims clearly define over the teachings of Mambakkam. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103 are respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the Office Action, and that as such, the Examiner is respectfully requested to send the application to Issue.

In the event there are any matters remaining in this application, the Examiner is invited to contact Cheng-Kang (Greg) Hsu, Registration No. 61,007 at (703) 205-8000 in the Washington, D.C. area.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Dated: February 19, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

By 

James M. Slattery

Registration No.: 28,380

#43,368

for BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

8110 Gatehouse Road

Suite 100 East

P.O. Box 747

Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747

(703) 205-8000

Attorney for Applicant

